

PSYCHO-FEMINIST STUDY OF DOLLY IN *THE GLASS PALACE*

P. SASI RATNAKER¹ & N. USHA²

¹Assistant Professor, Kallam Haranadha Reddy Institute of Technology, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India

²Head of the Department of English, Krishna University, Machilipatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Contextualized within a humanistic concern to transcend culturally constructed differences, this feminist study articulates the voice of the fragile and the ordinary women in everyday life, unrecorded in history. As Burmese royal attendant, Dolly's life appears smooth in the palace, as a chief manager of Outram House and a spouse to Timber baron Raj Kumar but she ends in a monastery. Her life in Burma struck a philosophical note in spite of her luxuries and love. This article considers Amitav Ghosh's *The Glass Palace* as a 'scathing critique' of British colonialism and explores Dolly's predicament and interior growth amidst generational differences as her compassion breaks real and imagined borders across Diaspora and the glass palace is shattered. The events in Dolly's life, her decisions and their repercussions are observed in feminist and psychological perspectives to justify her role in the context.

KEYWORDS: Dolly, Psychology, Displacement, Alienation, Feminism

INTRODUCTION

As an anthropologist and journalist, Ghosh's non-fictional work, *Dancing in Cambodia, At large in Burma* manifests itself as *The Glass Palace* later with richly imagined characters from India and Burma against the backdrop of the heterogeneous South-East Asia. Contemplating on the process that history can call unsuspecting people into roles of prominence, Ghosh reflects upon how Aung San Suu Kyi, an ordinary house wife, not a super-human in any sense, could forge Democracy movement in Burma. Similarly Dolly's physical and interior growth throughout the narrative, symbolizes the invasion of Burma itself. When many deserted the adversity struck Burmese royalty, Dolly joined the exile and served them until her marriage with Raj Kumar. David Glover and Cora Kaplan's (*Genders*, 2009:18) fluidity in gender is conspicuous in Dolly's character. Her behavior matured with time, situation and place blending masculine resilience and feminine docility. Dolly forgoes Mohan Bhai to the Princess and her confidant Uma, impressed with Dolly's adherence and alacrity, facilitates her marriage with Raj Kumar. Loyalty technically alienated Mohan Bhai, but her persistent emotional lure towards him conflicts with Raj Kumar's proposal only to accept it. Dolly forms part of power systems i.e. in Ratnagiri, the King and Queen, the Princess and finally Raj Kumar.

Dolly's acceptance of the power system is evident in opting to stay back as her co-attendants departed. Her inclination towards Raj Kumar on Uma's counseling and her return to Burma was out of her free will. But Weedon (*Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, 1987:2-3) and some feminist perspectives subordinate her apparent free will to patriarchy. Her allegiance is an inevitable compromise of destitution which delimits her thoughts beyond Outram House. 'Internalized norms of femininity' explains her continuance under somebody's care. While her diligence during contingency accorded her primacy (Ghosh, 2000: 82) her expectations of goodwill from the royal couple on her wedding proved futile (Ghosh, 2000:170-171). Insensitive in presuming her bound, the royal couple revealed their bitterness to her aspirations. A forensic rationalization in psychological and feminist perspectives possibly counters the allegations of eccentricity, evasion, resignation and opportunism suppositious in Dolly's character. The study keeps the reality element in

Ghosh's novels with disinterestedness facilitating appraisal of a human than appraisal of a heroine.

Ghosh's Feminism

Civilization reverberated with slogans of woman suffragists and the virgin and witch portrayal is obsolete. Yet the agony is unheard with silent tears ameliorating the scorched ego. Jane Eyre pays back for the derision of her 'audacity' in words: 'Women are supposed to be very calm generally: but women feel just as men feel'. Literature spawned feminism and glorified women writers with enduring works. Mary Wollstonecraft's non-aesthetic feminism stimulated variety in several conduits of expression. After the florescent start of Virago Press and Lucy Irigay's proposition for *Ecriture feminine* a male authors' sentience to transgender sensitivities lies in the gamut of debate. Felski's (1989:82) realism in feminist writing imbues general perspective into the psyche of subject conjuring 'subjective' realism. Realism is coupled with subjectivity as Kamala Markandeya's preferred cultural divide, racial prejudice and economic oppression to gender oppression (Jackson, 2010:22); Nayantara Sahgal dwarfed gendered issues before class privileges (Jackson, 2010:32) and Anita Desai emphasized patriarchy with subversive fatalism (Jackson, 2010:32). Jackson's opinion about the revered authors' adverts to Dolly's holistic portrayal atoning for the unaddressed facets in Indian feminist literature. Amitav Ghosh's feminist perspective in *The Glass Palace* asserts the male authors' perspicacity with an omniscient narration of feminist facets with transition of Dolly, Uma Dey and Queen Supalayay consistent with constructed reality. Modernity is conspicuous in the skillful blend of third wave feminist perspectives in womanhood of 1940-50s sans anachronism. The resolute women bear striking resemblance with Piya, Moyana and Deeti from other narratives. Perseverance of Ghosh's women subverts the binary constructs and Ghosh works out subtle marital incompatibility on a sensitive esoteric plane sans vulgar premises of discord.

Story Outline

The Glass Palace is a *Bildungsroman*, post modern and post colonial collage of politico-historic events all through. Realism and fictional liberty with history effortlessly evoke reader's credulousness and drama. The narrative's possible impossibilities precipitate different possibilities by constructing reality. Ghosh narrates teak harvest in Burma, eclipsed Burmese royalty, Indian freedom movement, disposition of colonial Indian officers and the gruesome exodus of Indians from Burma. Colonialism is poignantly subverted through characters like Uma, Dey, Dolly and Supalayay.

The fading regency heralding changes and intertexture of South Asian socio, political and economic formats reveals the crisis of old and new world order. Spanning two generations, the older one with Raj Kumar, Dolly, Uma while younger with Neel, Dinu and Alison whose shifting fortunes and interpersonal relations sustain the surprise element. The dramatized lives of migrant and the displaced are distinct threads on the looms of contemporary history and political developments. The phenomenal rise of a non descript Raj Kumar Raha to influential timber tycoon; his anti climactic marriage; reversal leading to degradation as a refugee forms the novel's crux. Dolly's fate relocates her to Burma from Ratnagiri to end in nunnery after life with Raj Kumar, Dinu and Neel. The Collector and Uma Dey contribute for the events in Ratnagiri as the audacious former provokes the ill fated King and Queen while the latter catalyses events in Dolly's life and stays distinct as dauntless feminist- political activist with an enlightened perception of contemporary politics. Dinu, Neel, Arjun, Alison, Manju and Saya John, swayed by vagaries of life and changing visage of Burma and India animate the sub plot of the narrative. Michelle Caswell's interview reveals that Ghosh's personal element relates personal histories to world's historical events with memories of his family's displacement induced by partition.

Literary Review and Proposition - Methodology Compliance

Women in Ghosh's novels formed the research material for scholars who peered into the various aspects of their

behavior. Malathi and Prema (2011) discussed Ghosh's reluctance to write the social traumas experienced by women hailing the avoidance of vilification, victimization and degradation of women. Tausif Sanzum (2012) explores the possibility of nationality and sexuality of women in Ghosh's novels. Hueso (2012) offers a deconstruction of national myth which relates women and motherhood with gestation and birth of new nation in Ghosh's novels. However, this article works towards an objective interpretation of Dolly's decisions and actions as if done by a behavior psychologist or feminist with findings of psychology, psychoanalysis and feminism bearing their relevance. Her psyche vividly reveals with a rational-empathetic appreciation of a feminist and clinical precision of psychologist.

DISCUSSIONS

Dolly avoids wrath of the Princess losing Mohan Bhai however, harbors notions about the child in Princess' womb (Ghosh, 2000: 118, 163) and accepts Raj Kumar on Mohan Bhai's counsel. An emotional Dolly contrasts with the ruthless Queen Supalayati. Feminist theory explains her emotion in Freidan's (*Feminine Mystique*, 1965:91-92) 'feminine mystique' suggesting Dolly's possible envy for a man. Dolly saw the royal duo asserting high esteem but time eroded dignity and their subdued stature was perspicuous with subjection and displacement. The King's submission contrasts with Mohan Bhai's impressive allegiance to the honor of royal family (Ghosh, 2000:84) and their common plane fascinates Dolly. Envy in comparable or similar levels (Salovey, 1991:7) and Mohan Bhai's masculinity and loyalty to Outram House balances the envy equation. Inferiority in her compulsion triggers envy about supplicant yet free willed Mohan Bhai. Desperation initiates an obsessive 'Reaction formation' to replace a repressed thought, feeling, or behavioral act with diametrical opposition ("International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis", 2005:1148). Her compelled adherence denies liberty and the obvious despise against Queen Supalayati in her allusion to Queen Victoria (Ghosh, 2000:114) represses into unconscious. Lost liberty substituted by loyalty is consequential of reaction formation termed as 'discrepancy' by Salovey (ibid). She lacks agency and Freidan's 'Feminine Mystique' explains her deprivation induced envy about her counterpart's liberty.

Dolly's erotic encounter with Mohan Bhai is explicatory in two perspectives. Sexuality is a discursive assortment of biological, socio cultural and psychoanalytic perspectives. In *Modernist Feminism in Post Modern Period*, Assiter (1996:138) interprets Lacanian sexuality conditioned by socio-cultural settings mediating 'real', biological and natural to seek a 'symbolic' for its expression. 'Symbolic' could be her protector King Thebaw, a fatherly projection stimulating Jungian Electra complex. Deposed, yet he bears a solemn aura revered by British and bureaucrats. Her complex is counteracted by a diametrical opposition in grandeur and Mohan Bhai becomes her *Object Choice* – an act of choosing a person to fix her attraction (ibid). *Instinctual Aim* resolves the internal tension and rationalizes her *Object Choice* ("Oxford Dictionary of Psychology," 2003:438).

Social constructionism speaks about male and female sexuality regulated by social forces. White, Boudurant and Travis (n.d:26) in "Social Constructions of Sexuality: Unpacking Hidden Meanings", remove the influential societal constructs on sexuality from biological determinism and associate them with socially constructed meanings invalidating reproductive behavior psychologically or socially. The theory's relevance to Mohan Bhai – Dolly's case can be essentialized from of Dolly's displacement altered identity. Inevitable acculturation eroded constructs like birth (which author calls as 'Shan extraction') and status. Difference is obvious in her initial encounter with Raj Kumar in the palace and later in Ratnagiri. In the palace as caretaker to sovereign's progeny, Dolly's reaction was restrictively guarded (Ghosh, 2000:33). Her response suggests estrangement to outsiders with palatial restrictive poise that changed in the rural locale where the erstwhile royalty were venerated and sympathized at once. Drawn into the social vortex of Ratnagiri and Mohan Bhai was pivotal to her in serving Outram House. Mohan Bhai is comparable with Raj Kumar in status.

Her stifled response to Raj Kumar eased as her relation with Mohan Bhai was conditioned by occasional contingencies. The kingly grandeur decayed relegating Dolly's status from a royal attendant to a manager melting the inhibitions. Rejection of King's plea to visit Burma necessitated her acculturation and consequential attraction towards Mohan Bhai.

Jyoth Puri (*Woman, Body, Desire in Post-colonial India*, 1999:115) asserts Indian cultural identity in premarital chastity supposed imperative for Indian middle-class women but Dolly's commitment to Mohan Bhai inviolates this normative prescription. Manifest complex to mother Mohan Bhai's child to be delivered by Princess happens with sublimated internalization of their informal relation frustrated by the coveting Princess. Repressed feelings and desires were forged into a lofty passion to facilitate escape cum association mechanism soothing the brunt of separation. Her love unscathed in deemed maternity to the unborn child is dispelled after marriage with Raj Kumar. Initial disinclination to Raj Kumar is overridden by Mohan Bhai's counsel enlightening her about the impossibility of their union. Marriage with Raj Kumar arises out of *Avoidance-Avoidance Conflict* where avoidance of one of the two undesirable goals involves approaching other (Nevid, 2009:448). Dolly appreciates Mohan Bhai's desperate acceptance of the Princess' advancements along with the intolerably ponderous memories of love inevitable in Ratnagiri, but on contrary, she refuses Raj Kumar stating her association with Ratnagiri. Marriage leads to relocation and a new undesirable identity in Burma. Initial refusal on being persuaded by Raj Kumar, Mohan Bhai and Uma converts to *Approach-Avoidance Conflict* – a choice of goal that is negative and positive at once (ibid). Positively, marriage could relieve her from crisis and the negative end i.e. conflict of allegiance to Mohan Bhai resolves with Mohan Bhai's persuasion.

Dolly narrates her dream with Uma, "He woke up and looked at me and touched my face. And then he said: Shall we go? We went outside, and when we were in the moonlight I saw that it was not Mohan Bhai [...] It was him [Raj Kumar]" (Ghosh, 2000:162). The intrigue is answered by 'Sigmund Freud: Interpretation of Dreams (1900)' calling dream as a defensive mechanism to vent a distorted version of issues repressed in unconscious (Bowden, 2011:113). The Princess' threat causes repression and its distorted version projects Raj Kumar in the dream. As one's self centered dream reveals an unexpressed aspect of oneself, (ibid) Dolly substitutes Raj Kumar for Mohan Bhai for the latter is forbidden. *Displacement* avoids dangerous impulses by recourse to safe objects or substituting another impulse which helps Dolly to overwhelm her yearning for Mohan Bhai. Specifically the 'drive displacement' operates with a stable object of emotion but a safer emotion substitutes the original ("The Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology," 2011:179). Ambivalence is imperceptible in Dolly's words with Uma: 'I woke up. I was terrified. I was in your house, in that bedroom. I couldn't bear to stay another moment. I went and woke Khanoji' (ibid). Khanoji associates with Mohan Bhai in social strata and profession and talk with Khanoji sated her. The words denote the guilt associated with unconscious and intolerable displacement of Mohan Bhai with Raj Kumar.

Adjustment Disorder stems from straining personal or professional disasters where anger, aggression and defiance relegate into passive and depressive withdrawal called *depersonalization* ("The Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology," 2011:10). Dolly's passivity pointed by Raj Kumar relates to the above explanation. A humiliating departure from Outram House followed by void experienced in a new social ecosystem aggravated by xenophobic stigma makes her confide in Uma (Ghosh, 2000:240). Dolly's awareness of Raj Kumar's extra marital affairs is presumable to aggravate the incompatibility.

Dolly's primiparous experience disarrayed her and contrary to Hoffnung's words, (1995) her motherhood revived her conflicts, affected flexibility and empathy and deprived intimate loving connections with self accusation for begetting a fragile child like Dinu (Ghosh, 2000:174). Her dedication to Dinu invites accusation of alienation from Raj Kumar exasperating the brooding guilt. Laing (*The Self and Others*, 1961:251) wrote about the mutuality in social realities

mediated to a woman and her experience of world i.e. 'the transference of a pattern of relations from one modality of experience to others: namely from perception to imagination, memory, dreams, phantasies, etc'. 'Family' has 3 frames of reference for Dolly one being Outram house, second one with Raj Kumar and the third is Burma that turned irreversibly hostile. Conflict is unresolved in these three places: with loyalty humiliated at Outram House; Raj Kumar's adulterous affairs and the xenophobic contempt brewing in Burma. Raj Kumar lacks conjugal fidelity which she sympathizes with love. Raj Kumar entrusted to Uma her while renunciation reiterates her unperceived love. Her sustenance was assured Raj Kumar while departing to exile: "*Yes, of course, this was what one must do; Dolly was doing exactly what has to be done. What purpose would it serve for these girls to make a futile show of resentment? How could they succeed in defiance when the very army of the realm has succumbed? No better by far to wait, and in the meanwhile to smile. This way Dolly would live*" (Ghosh, 2000:46) Her persistence culminated in renunciation intense religious fervor - a solace for her unacknowledged loyalty.

Though no marital disharmony is accentuated, the narrative is non committal on Dolly's heartfelt contentment. Dolly's passivity mismatches with Raj Kumar's exuberance. An unceremonious departure from Outram House, her conflict laden condition prior to marriage, and return to long forgotten Burma contributes to the passivity (ibid). Dinu with persistent illness recalled the times she nursed the princess. The couple lacked the fine cordiality belying Uma expectations. Dolly's renunciation results out *extinction*, a decline in frequency of response due to poor reinforcing stimuli (Leslie, 2002:85). Initial vibrancy in marriage flags making her reclusive as Uma's reflections predicts extinction in Dolly's life (Ghosh, 2000:186).

Her aloofness intrigues Raj Kumar and the dialogue with Dolly brews discontentment (Ghosh, 2000:208). The sight of a corpse of Dinu's age precipitates the philosophic-spiritual perspectives in her. Dolly confides in Uma about the void engulfing her love for Raj Kumar (Ghosh, 2000:239-40). Bitter reminiscences of Ratnagiri lingering in her mind, discordance with husband, ordeal of failed motherly aspirations and embittered Burmese maligned her peace denying reinforcement of her efforts and hopes. Dinu's reclusiveness over weighed her guilt about his impairment. The conjugal mellowness was subdued by vagaries and life sans reinforcement of stimuli affected her response. The withdrawal sublimated into religiosity culminated in her renunciation. She stumbles upon the monastery in the city ironically while trying to resist *extinction* (Leslie, 2002:89). Her renunciation alleges repudiation of womanly obligations. Rita Gross refers to the unacknowledged femininity in Buddhist *Sanga* or community interpreting the feminine values like nurturance, communication, relationship and friendship as vital (Jasper, 2006:128). In Sule Pagoda, she recalls King Thebaw emphasizing *karuna*: compassion for the immanence of all living things in each other, for the attraction of life for its likeness (Ghosh, 2000:211). *Karuna* leads to concern and realization and embodies feminine values of 'nurturance, communication, relationship and friendship' pursued by Dolly in *Sangha*.

Hegemony is perceptible in Raj Kumar's relation with Dolly with love for her revealed in Dolly's presupposed consent after a silent hiatus. Dolly's response to Raj Kumar's proposal informs her decisiveness against his audacity (Ghosh, 2000:164-65) but contrarily her post marital expression is perceivably constricted and hysterical. Defensive of her aloofness, she justifies her commitment to Dinu: "She flinched. She knew it was true that she'd neglected her elder son lately. But Neel was filled with energy, boisterousness and loud-voiced goodwill and Raj Kumar doted on him. With Dinu on the other hand, he was nervous and tentative; frailty and weakness worried him, puzzled him: he had never expected to encounter these in his own progeny" (Ghosh, 2000:209). She laughs uneasily, "Where would I go if I left you behind?" When Raj Kumar pushes the conversation she breaks in throes saying, "What wall? What are you talking about?" (ibid). Again later her reaction about Raj Kumar's ventures accentuates her resignation blended with despair

(Ghosh, 2000:316). Talbot (*Feminism and Language*, 2006:114) discusses the misconstrued conversational variance between men and women by rationalizing the 'less conversational competitiveness' with gender disregarding the contextual differences. Obvious variance in Dolly's tone while defending her aloofness as the reference about Dinu shows her guilt for begetting a frail child to a vivacious father like Raj Kumar and the abrupt conversation aggravates her reaction contrasting with her assertiveness in other cases. Jackson (*Contemporary Feminist Theories* 1998:20) speaks of the structural inequalities of class and gender which alienated men from their own seed for which men had to appropriate the fruits of women's reproductive labor as their own. As Kristeva (*Tales of Love*, 1983/1987:57) spoke of the tendency to annex the cherished other, to project herself onto it, to monopolize it, to dominate it, to suffocate it', Dolly's internalized cultural element led to self accusation that she belied her husband's fatherly expectations with a frail child

Discussing the intensity determining intimacy of relationships between couples, Jeter (*Intimate Relations*, 2002:173-174) defines intimacy as 'an ongoing emotional connection to "remove his or her mask" (my italics) causing the exchange of thoughts and feelings. Dolly's aloofness is pertinent to the loss of intimacy for the mask of separation spun by their past. Raj Kumar's initial impression was that of what a migrant Indian *Kaala* can affect upon a royal attendant. Later, affluent Raj Kumar's proposal invites Dolly's antagonism towards the pallbearers of colonialism sharing the spoils of imperialism precipitated by her sympathy for the deposed King and colonized Burmese. Ratnagiri's Collector, a colonial symbol and Raj Kumar who share the spoils of Burma's subjugation lack rapport in contrast to her intimacy with Uma. With repressed antagonism, she travels to Burma as Raj Kumar's spouse. Dolly hesitates about her identity on migration to Burma: "they would call me a *Kaala* like they do Indians – a trespasser, an outsider from across the sea" (Ghosh, 2000:113). Dolly's alienation in her native land problematizes displacement and alienation irrespective of her deficiencies or choice. She is identified as a *Kaala*'s wife after her marriage. Dolly's double consciousness one as imperial staff of puissant Burmese monarch and the other as an attendant of an exiled monarch places Raj Kumar in the crisis of these contrasting planes keeping her *mask* intact. Her uprightness is incompatible with the Raj Kumar's shrewd business acumen. Split in opinions, Dolly droops into a resigned despair (Ghosh, 2000:316).

The Concise Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology and Behavior Science (2004:373) characterizes High extroverts by social interaction, high activity levels, and positive emotions while Low extroverts favor solitude and a reserved, quiet, and independent interpersonal style with a happy and friendly nature'. High conscientious people are organized, reliable, hard-working, self-directed, deliberate, ambitious, and persevering while Low conscientious people are disorganized, aimless, lazy, careless, lax, negligent, and hedonistic' (ibid). Raj Kumar displays traits like Extroversion and Conscientiousness while Dolly features Low extroversion. Jeter quotes Thibaut and Kelly's theory to evaluate marital balance mentioning the Comparison Level (CL) - what a person believes he or she deserves; and the Comparison Level for alternative (CLalt.) - The best available alternative to the current relationship (*Intimate Relations*, 2002: 184). Raj Kumar had fulfillment in marriage with beautiful and intelligent Dolly and Dolly earned place in the high society of Burma. The status exists with her reluctance to live in Burma confinement to the mundane household. Raj Kumar complains Dolly's withdrawal highlighting the separation between them. The theory suggests the disgruntlement for having 'less than they deserve' and their choice in limited alternatives affected the balance between them (ibid). Marital disaffection as told by Kersten ("The process of marital disaffection", 1990:39) led to loss of affection and emotional attachment, with rising negative or apathetic feeling toward a partner has set in their relation culminating in Dolly's departure.

CONCLUSIONS

Dolly reminds Horney's (1967) rejection of the anatomical distinction upholding the duality of genders in women. Horney writes about girl reminded of her inferiority for which she compensates by imbibing masculinity. Outram House

proved congenial to sublimate her complex with the King, Queen and Princesses relegated to mere idols of royalty while Dolly played trouble shooter. But marriage reversed her role by bloating and compressing her into mother of an impaired child and a wifely passivity at once. The repressed masculine complex and culture defined re-orientation to femininity conflict are sublimated by religion and renunciation resolves the conflict by neutralizing her complex with prostration before a power beyond gendered constructs.

Leo Bersani (1978) moderates possible allegations of hypersensitivity and anti-realism in Dolly's renunciation who says that society's clash with hero [here heroine] with the latter's refusal to budge affects realism making the novel more allegorical as the hero's fervor disrupts established orders and Dolly's acquiescence saves realism. Distressed by subverted hopes and disasters, her transition is circumstantial reiterating the dimension of spiritual refuge amidst vagaries of life bearing allusion to Kamala Das' words:

At the hour of worship even a stone becomes an idol. I was.
Perhaps seeking a familiar face that blossomed like a blue lotus in
The waters of my dreams. It was to get closer to that bodiless one.
That I approached other forms and I lost my way. I may have gone.
Astray, but not once did I forget my destination (*My Story*, 1988).

REFERENCES

1. Assiter, A. (1996). *Enlightened Women: Modernist Feminism in a Post Modern Age*. London: Routledge.
2. Bersani, L. (1978). *A Future for Astyanax: Character and Desire in Literature*. London: Marion Boyars.
3. Bowden, B. T. (2007). *50 Psychology Classics*. Finland: WS Bookwell.
4. Colman, M. C. (Ed.). (2003). *Oxford Dictionary of Psychology*.
5. Craighead, W. E & Nemeroff, C. B. (Ed.). (2004). *the Concise Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology and Behavior Science*.
6. Das, Kamala. (1988). *My Story*. New Delhi: Sterling.
7. Felski, R. (1989). *Beyond Feminist Aesthetics*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
8. Friedan, B. (1965). *The Feminine Mystique*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
9. Ghosh, A. (2000). *The Glass Palace*. India: Harper Collins.
10. Glover, D & Kora, K. (2009). *Genders: The New Critical Idiom*. Oxon, NY and Canada: Routledge.
11. Hoffnung, M. (1995). Motherhood: Contemporary Conflict for Women. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A Feminist Perspective* (pp. 162-181). CA: Mayfield.
12. Horney, K. (1967). The Flight from Womanhood: The Masculinity Complex in Women, as Viewed by Men and by Women. In H. Kelman (Ed.) *Feminine psychology*. New York: Norton.
13. Hubbard, K. (2012). *Serving Victoria: Life in the Royal Household*. UK: Chatto and Windus.
14. Huston, T. L & Holmes, E. K. (2004). Becoming Parents. In A. L. Vangelisti (Ed.), *Handbook of Family Communication* (pp. 105-133). New Jersey: Erlbaum.

15. Hueso, M.E.M. (2008). Woman, Genealogy, History: Deconstructions of Family and Nation in Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines* and Manju Kapur's *Difficult Daughters*. *Odesia*, 9, 155-166.
16. The article can be retrieved from http://www.ual.es/odisea/odisea09content_EN.html
17. Jackson, E. (2010). *Feminism in Contemporary Indian Woman Writings*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.
18. Jackson, S & Jones, J. (1998). *Contemporary Feminist Theories*. England: Edinburgh UP.
19. Jasper, A. (2006). Feminism and Religion. In Sarah Gamble (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Post Feminism* (pp. 125-132). New York: Routledge.
20. Jeter, F. R. (2000). Intimate Relationships. In Maryka Biaggio & Michel Hersen (Eds.), *Issues in Psychology of Woman* (pp. 173-198). USA: Springer.
21. Kersten, K. (1990). The process of marital disaffection: Interventions at various stages. *Family Relations*, 39, 257-265. DOI: 10.2307/584869
22. Kristeva, J. (1983/1987). *Tales of Love*. trans. Le'on S. Roudiez, New York: Columbia UP.
23. Laing, R. D. (1961). *The Self and Others*. London: Tavistock.
24. Leslie, J. C. (2002). *Essential Behavior Analysis*. London and New York: OUP and Arnold.
25. Malathi & Prema. (2011). Portrayal of Woman in Selected Novels of Amitav Ghosh. *The Journal of English Language and Literary Studies*, 1.3, 1-6. The article can be retrieved from http://www.tjells.com/previous_article.
26. Mijolla, A. (Ed.). (2005). *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*.
27. Michelle Caswell (personal communication, n.d.).
28. Mitchell, J. (2000). *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. New York: Basic.
29. Nevid, J. S. (2009). *Psychology: Concepts and Applications*. USA: Houghton Mifflin.
30. Puri, J. (1999). *Woman, Body, Desire in Post-colonial India*. NY & London: Routledge.
31. Sanzum, Tausif. (2012). Identifying Woman's Position: Exploring Time, Space and Sexuality in Amitav Ghosh's Novels (BA Dissertation). Retrieved from dspace.bracu.ac.bd/bitstream/handle/10361/2410/09303001.PDF
32. Salovey, P. (1991). *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*. New York: Guilford.
33. Strickland, B. (Ed.). (2001). *The Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology*.
34. Talbot, A. M. (2006). Feminism and Language. In Sarah Gamble (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Post Feminism* (pp. 111-116). New York: Routledge.
35. Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. UK: Blackwell.
36. White, J.W, Bondurant, B & Travis, C.B. (n.d.) Social Constructions of Sexuality: Unpacking Hidden Meanings. In Cheryl Brown Travis & Jacqueline W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, Society and Feminism* (pp. 11-34). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.